

31st October 1931]

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the answers to clauses (a) and (b) of question No. 450 and the answer to question No. 437.

(c) Nonē.

*Alleged ban by the First-class Magistrate, Gudur, on the Zamindari Ryots' Conference proposed to be held at Venkatagiri.*

\* 440 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased—

(i) to state whether the Government have taken explanation from the Sub-Collector-Magistrate of Gudur for issuing orders under section 144 against the holding of a Zamindari Ryots' Conference at Venkatagiri; and

(ii) to place the correspondence on the table?

A.—(i) No.

(ii) No.

*Alleged issue of an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, against the organizers of the Depressed Classes Conference at Eluvankottai.*

\* 441 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to lay on the table of this House the report referred to in answer to question No. 164 asked on 5th August 1931?

A.—A copy \* of the Sub-Magistrate's order, dated the 14th June 1931, is placed on the table.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—“The order passed by the Sub-Magistrate is printed in the Appendix. May I know, Sir, whether Government is aware that this order has caused resentment among the depressed classes in view of the fact that they are law abiding and peaceful citizens?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—  
“No.”

### Labour

*Operations of the Labour Department in Tinnevely district.*

\* 442 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) when the operations of the Labour Department were started in Tinnevely district; and

(b) to how many taluks the operations of the Labour Department were extended and how many of the taluks are left untouched by the department?

A.—(a) In 1929–1930.

(b) The operations of the department have so far extended to four taluks.